REMARKS

The following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated August 10, 2004. Claims 1-2 are pending in this application. In the outstanding Office Action the Abstract was objected to and claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). No new matter has been added. Claims 1-2 are presented for consideration.

Abstract Objection

The Office Action objected to the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended to place the Abstract in better form. Therefore, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract.

35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kato (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,850) in view of Rector (U.S. Patent No. 5,798,798). In making this rejection, the Examiner asserts that the combination of these two references teaches and/or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants disagree and request reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 1 recites in part:

> compression rate control means for updating, every time the signal corresponding to one field has been compressed by the compression means, the compression rate stored in the by-channel compression rate storage area, corresponding to the inputted signal, in the storage means to such a value that an amount of coding after the compression approaches a predetermined target amount of coding on the basis of the amount of coding after the compression and the target amount of coding.

Claim 2 recites in part:

> a compression rate control circuit for updating, every time the signal corresponding to one field has been compressed by the compression circuit, the compression rate stored in the by-channel compression rate storage area, corresponding to the inputted signal, in the storage device to such a value that an amount of coding after the compression approaches a predetermined target amount of coding on the basis of the amount of coding after the compression and the target amount of coding.

Consequently, in the present invention, the compression rate for each camera is controlled based on the amount of coding after compression of video signals from the camera and the predetermined target amount of coding. Therefore, the compression rate for one camera is independent of the compression rates for the other cameras. Consequently, the present invention does not involve controlling the compression rates to make the sum total of the compression rates for respective cameras constant.

In contrast, Kato at col. 2, lines, 5-21 teaches:

> The encoding bit rate control circuit 103 calculates encoding bit rates R1-Rn corresponding to the property of input picture images of respective encoders from n number of video signals inputted thereto and encoding bit quantities from respective encoders. <u>At this time, control is conducted such that sum total of R1 to Rn every predetermined time becomes constant</u>. Encoding bit rates of respective encoders $101_1 - 101_n$ are changed every 15 frames, for example. Transmitting buffers $102_1 - 102_n$ are respectively provided at succeeding stages of respective encoders $101_1 - 101_n$ to respectively temporarily store encoded data from the respective encoders $101_1 - 101_n$ into the transmitting buffers $102_1 - 102_n$ to absorb changes of code quantities generated. The multiplexing circuit 104 multiplexes, in a time divisional manner, plural output bit streams respectively delivered from the respective buffers $102_1 - 102_n$ to send out it to the transmission path as single bit stream.

Consequently, Kato teaches that control is conducted such that the sum total of the encoding bit rates R1-Rn provided for respective encoders becomes constant, thereby making constant the bit rate for the single bit stream obtained by multiplexing in a time

divisional manner plural output bit streams respectively delivered from the buffers 102_1 – 102_n.

In contrast, the present invention controls the compression rate for each camera based on the amount of coding after compression of video signals from the camera and the predetermined target amount of coding. Kato does not disclose "controlling the compression rate for each camera based on the amount of coding after compression of video signals from the camera and the predetermined target amount of coding.

Rector is not cited for nor does Rector correct this deficiency in Kato.

Accordingly, the combination of Kato and Rector fails to each and/or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, these references fail to teach and/or suggest a "compression rate control means for updating, every time the signal corresponding to one field has been compressed by the compression means, the compression rate stored in the by-channel compression rate storage area, corresponding to the inputted signal, in the storage means to such a value that an amount of coding after the compression approaches a predetermined target amount of coding on the basis of the amount of coding after the compression and the target amount of coding. Similarly, these references also fail to teach and/or suggest "a compression rate control circuit for updating, every time the signal corresponding to one field has been compressed by the compression circuit, the compression rate stored in the by-channel compression rate storage area, corresponding to the inputted signal, in the storage device to such a value that an amount of coding after the compression approaches a predetermined target amount of coding on the basis of the amount of coding after the compression and the

target amount of coding." Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicant's remarks have overcome the rejection set forth in the Office Action dated August 10, 2004. Specifically, Applicant's amendment to the Abstract overcomes the objection to the Abstract. Applicants' remarks have distinguished claims 1-2 from Kato and Rector and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly claims 1-2 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2.

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the even that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing attorney docket number 107314-00009.

Respectfully submitted,

Rustan J. Hill
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/tdd